DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 477 508 SP 041 590

AUTHOR	Silberman-Keller, Diana
TITLE	Toward the Characterization of Non-Formal Pedagogy.
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	55p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Centers; Elementary Education; Experiential Learning ; *Informal Education; Local Government; Museums; Play; Socialization; Teaching Methods; Youth Agencies

ABSTRACT

This study examined characteristic attributes of non-formal education and the non-formal pedagogy directing its teaching and learning processes. Data were collected on organizational and pedagogical characteristics in several out-of-school organizations (youth movements, youth organizations, community centers, bypass educational systems, local government agencies offering cultural and other activities geared to youth, and museums of art, science, and history with educational departments or branches). Interviews with key players focused on what was being taught, who the teachers were, how teaching was accomplished, and how the organizations understood their role in facilitating teaching and learning. Texts pertaining to the educational organizations were also reviewed. Results highlighted consistently recurring activities, values, and behaviors. Four major genres were revealed: the generative element genre, the administrative-organizational genre, the genre of informal learning, and the genre of the social function of non-formal education. Characteristic practices in non-formal pedagogy included practices that: initiated and fostered images of time and place; engendered phenomenological processes of teaching and learning through which knowledge was singularly negotiated; applied dialogue and conversation in teaching and learning processes; and used play to shape the bond between reality and probability by expanding the notion of what was considered within the bounds of plausible reality. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 477 508

Toward the Characterization of Non-Formal Pedagogy

Aera Annual Meeting, 21-25 April, 2003.

Chicago, U.S.A

Dr. Diana Silberman-Keller ©

Beit – Berl College, Israel

Introduction

The term "non-formal pedagogy" refers to a theoretical and practical framework encompassing the entire spectrum of initiatives and activities within non-formal educational organizations (Bertrand & Houssaye; Houssaye, 1993).[1] As opposed to other pedagogical forms whose theories are well formulated and whose principles are clearly documented, the concept of non-formal pedagogy has not yet been considered in the professional literature and exists in practice primarily in the field.

The purpose of this essay is to reveal and clarify the characteristic attributes of non-formal education and of the non-formal pedagogy that directs its teaching and learning processes.

Based upon the research for this essay, non-formal pedagogy can be characterized by four instructional practices that have shaped its unique nature:

1. Practices that initiate and foster image of time and place.

© All Rights reserved to Dr. Diana Silberman - Keller

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Diana Silberman-Keller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP041590

2. Practices that engender phenomenological processes of teaching and learning through which knowledge is singularly negotiated.

3. Practices that apply dialogue and discourse in teaching and learning processes.

4. Practices that use play to shape the bond between reality and probability by expanding the notion of what is considered within the bounds of plausible reality.

As noted, these practices are integrated across the spectrum of non-formal educational activities. It is this integrated configuration that has generated the internal coherence found in non-formal education, thus providing a unique definition of the term "education."

Data

Data collection for the current study focused on educational organizations beyond the school wall. The out-of-school organizations chosen for the study were classified into representative prototypes, as follows: youth movements; youth organizations; community centers; by-pass educational systems[2]; local government agencies offering cultural and other activities geared to young people; and museums of art, science and history with educational departments or branches.

Data was collected based on two criteria, organizational characteristics and pedagogical characteristics, under the assumption that the two are related. The pedagogical aspect of data collection focused on questions such as the following: What is being taught? Who is teaching whom? How is it being accomplished? The

organizational side examined how educational organizations understand their role in facilitating teaching and learning.

The tools used in data collection included interviewing key people and reading and analyzing texts issued by or pertaining to the educational organizations studied, for example instructional booklets, curricula, promotional flyers, newspaper advertisements, administrative texts and educational circulars.

The data was interpreted on two levels. First, common practices in non-formal education were investigated and clarified. The findings were then classified, compared and interpreted according to images of time and place, phenomenological elements, built-in forms of dialogue and debate, and, finally, patterns of play other than those already catalogued in the *Haphalopedia* [3]. The analysis of the findings revealed consistently recurring activities, values and behaviors. This essay elaborates upon the generalizations that can be drawn from these detected consistencies.

The following review of pedagogical and theoretical texts in the fields of literary criticism and semiotics provides the theoretical framework used to interpret and analyze the data.

Theoretical Background

Pedagogy and Literature

Bruner (1986) identifies two types of cognitive functioning or two forms of thought, each offering an alternative way of organizing experience and thus of structuring reality. The first type is paradigmatic or scientific-logical. It seeks to realize an ideal

method of describing and explaining reality by means of a formal and/or mathematical system that is subject to validation.[4]

The second type of cognitive functioning is narrative. It organizes reality through stories, dramatic structures and credible (though not necessarily "real") historical reports. This type considers the motivating intentions for human activities based upon unfolding events and their consequences. Expanding upon Bruner, I have assumed that every form of pedagogy shapes and reflects a narrative that supplies its basic assumptions as well as all the components participating in its expression or its activities. This narrative constitutes a unique genre known as "the text of educational ideologies" that is comprised of all the textual practices that have helped construct it. These practices engender a high level of verisimilitude in educational texts, contributing to their credibility and hence to their public acceptance. The textual processes that have created ideological educational texts are also what set these texts apart on a number of levels: the rhetorical level responsible for a text's powers of persuasion; the narrative level responsible for conceiving of the characters and the plot of the pedagogical agenda; the communicative level that determines the nature of the text through the relationship between sender and receiver; the inter-textual level that helps the text be understood and accepted by the public (Keller, 1992, 1994, 1997; Silberman-Keller, 1997).[5]

The narrative form that has emerged from the findings of this study has provided a basis for identifying and interpretively analyzing the characteristic practices of non-formal pedagogy. I believe that images of time and place, information and knowledge design within educational activities, forms of dialogue and discourse, and patterns of play together stand out as the unique practices of non-formal pedagogy; they

constitute an integral part of its narrative and hence offer us knowledge and insight into its very existence. These four typical practices of teaching and learning contribute to the creation of a unique educational idiosyncrasy that defines and is defined by its characters and plot as its way of being in the world.

The research for this essay examined non-formal pedagogy by sifting through literature imbued with activities generated as a result of this very pedagogy. By coining the term "non-formal pedagogy," this study has opened a new and distinctive research perspective on non-formal education.[6]

A Few Comments on the Study of Non-Formal Education

The scope of this essay is too narrow to accommodate a comprehensive and in-depth review of the history of non-formal education research. Nonetheless, some of the trends in this research field can provide background and perhaps even a rationale for adopting the theoretical and methodological ideas upon which this study is based. Therefore, following are a few comments on issues I believe have shaped this research.

The story of non-formal education parallels the historical development of formal education in modern times.[7] Over the course of their development, both underwent changes in their format as well as their social functions. But while formal education has in modern times become a centralized state network distributing hegemonic knowledge along with certificates and diplomas to be used by its students in their future professional lives, non-formal education has remained at the margins of national educational systems. It has spawned a decentralized and diffuse system

representative of ideological and political movements incorporating resistance to, or at the very least criticism of, the educational hegemonies in many societies.

Thus it is reasonable to assume that signs of these differentiating attributes will emerge with advances in research in the field of non-formal education, for these features are more than simply parts of prevailing public opinion regarding these two forms of education: formal and non-formal.

The underlying notions upon which investigators in the field of non-formal education have based their assumptions, then, include its marginal and often bizarre nature and its decentralization, which often borders on apparent coincidence. Their approach stands in opposition to the major research projects in the field of formal education that is defined and funded as canonical and significant.

Hence, finding a relevant and consistent thread tying together all the studies in the field of non-formal education is problematic. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify four major genres in this research field. These genres also convey the accumulated findings typical of studies carried out over the last fifty years. Often several research genres are interwoven in a single study, but the epistemological dominance of the most outstanding genre makes it possible to isolate its main trends.

The Generative Element Genre

Investigators in the field of non-formal education have delved into its very essence in an attempt to identify its generative elements.

The theoretical inspiration for Kahane's investigation of the "informal code"[8] can be found in structural sociology as well as in an epistemological approach that favors a

democratic regime and sees voluntary social organizations as a means of realizing and maintaining this regime. This combination of theory an epistemology, which is almost political in nature, has directed a study that on the one hand identified the structural dimensions of non-formal organizations (in Kahane's terms) while on the other hand defined an ideal model for informality. According to this model, the central dimensions of the informal code include voluntarism, symmetry, moratorium and diversity. The extent to which these dimensions exist within an organization determines the degree to which it can be characterized as non-formal in nature. The sample population in Kahane's study was comprised of youth movements in Israel and worldwide. Based upon this population and the implications of the study, a connection was established between Kahane's theoretical code of informality and non-formal education as epitomized by youth movements.

According to Jeffs and Smith (1999), conversation is the generative element of non-formal education. They base their determination upon the perspective of a number of educational philosophers, beginning with Dewey, George Eliot and Julius Nyerere and including Neal Postman and others as well. Jeffs and Smith believe that conversation takes place within people's ordinary lives; it expands experience, encourages learning and enhances democracy through the practice of criticizing political life in its broadest sense.[9]

The Administrative-Organizational Genre

In his book *Learning Networks in Adult Education,* Fordham (1979) tells how the participants at an international conference in Williamsburg, Virginia in 1967 reached the conclusion that the world is experiencing a crisis in education. Conference

attendees generally concurred that existing school curricula were no longer suitable, that growth in education had not matched economic growth and that expansion of the number of workplaces had not kept up with educational development. Many countries found it difficult economically as well as politically to pay to broaden formal education. Concurrently, UNESCO began to develop concepts of "lifelong education" and "learning society," both of which, according to Fordham, were coined in the famous UNESCO Faure Report of 1972, *Learning to Be*.[10] According to this report, "continuing education" should have been the concept according to which the entire educational system would be tailored.

What actually did ensue was a categorization of learning systems, the most comprehensive listing of which can be found in the works of Coombs, Sylvester and Ahmed (1973-1979).[11] These works correlate highly with a definition of the administrative and organizational genre in non-formal educational research.

In this categorization, three different forms of education were distinguished: formal, non-formal and informal. Formal education was identified with state educational systems that encourage enforcement of compulsory education laws and supply institutions of learning which grant degrees and diplomas. Non-formal educational systems were found to complement or offer an alternative to formal education. These non-formal systems were further sub-categorized based upon their appearance in developed and developing nations. In developed countries, non-formal education supplemented school education through spiritual, ethical and political enrichment offered by the governmental, cultural and religious powers that be. In developing nations, in contrast, non-formal education served as an alternative to formal and professional education. Lacking an overall framework, this form of non-formal

education was implemented through means such as the media, the street or even happenstance.[12]

Investigators who focused on describing and analyzing the role of education in developing nations adopted a more critical stance in their categorization of educational systems.[13]

The Genre of Informal Learning

Research interest in investigating informal learning as a learning pattern taking place in out/after school programs or innovative schools has recently increased. Part of this trend is based on research on informal learning[14] as taking place in traditional societies. Some of the unique features of informal learning include its position within an existing social context, its idiosyncratic integration of the relationship of goals to learning methods, and its holistic use of cognitive and emotional elements in learning.[15]

Research on informal learning in modern societies has developed in two main directions. The first focuses on how this approach has been implemented beyond the school wall in science, history and art museums and in after school' programs, primarily in the United States. The second investigates its inclusion in the workplace particularly in England. These two directions probably illustrate how informal learning has been adopted in theory and in practice for dealing with the problems researchers in the 1970s set out to investigate, as described previously.

In some respects it seems that these new developments on informal learning are intended to deal with the cultural and social integration of immigrant and minority

groups into American and other developed societies as well as with science and language literacy[16]

The investigation of informal learning in the workplace serves as an attempt to generate coherence and continuity between formal training and learning on the one hand and on-the-job learning on the other so as to alleviate the known gap between educational development and the need to include mostly "on-line" information and techniques. This is accomplished by making learning processes at work more deliberate and methodical in an era in which "change is the most fixed variable in our lives." This condition necessitates methods for constant adaptation and adjustment with respect to developing knowledge.[17]

The Genre of the Social Function of Non-Formal Education

The prevailing public notion of formal and non-formal education assumes an ongoing comparison between these two educational forms with respect to all matters, including resource allocation. I believe that this conceptual contrast has led to the research genre that deals with the social function of non-formal educational systems. These systems have shaped unique social roles (Gal, 1985). For example, they serve as mechanisms for change in formal education (Lamm, 1975; Noam, 2002); they are capable of developing an orientation toward change and progress while remaining faithful to values and norms (Kahane, 1975); they help determine policy in a way that bypasses government policymaking systems (Keller, 1987); they prevent petrifaction of the educational canon (Keller, 1996); and they contribute to developing and enhancing the significance of the nation (Bock and Papagianis, 1983).[18]

This research genre also seeks to grant social legitimization to non-formal education for its unique and special functions justify its existence and support the need to promote research in this field.

The Research Genres of Non-Formal Education and the Development of Research into Non-Formal Pedagogy

The debate over the idiosyncratic nature of non-formal education can be found in each of the research genres discussed above, usually accompanied by apologetic statements that on the one hand underscore the importance of non-formal education while on the other disparage the limited research interest in it. The new concept of non-formal pedagogy seeks to become an integral element of research carried out to date and to integrate the various research genres. It represents an attempt to express and formulate, by adopting a phenomenological approach, the conceptual platform of non-formal education as is manifested in teaching practices.

More specifically, in the case of non-formal education, non-formal pedagogy seeks to define its guiding pedagogy in the hope that this input will also serve to develop the research genres outlined above and perhaps generate new genres as well.

Characteristic practices in non-formal pedagogy

1. Practices that initiate and foster images of time and place

The educational act as a whole is bound up in the literature that stipulates it existence. Legitimization and social norms are based upon this literature and follow from it, for in this literary form someone teaches something to someone else, and it is this literary act that shapes the nature of the educational plot.

Like any other plot, the educational plot occurs at a specified time and place (Keller, 1997), so that the two elements of time and place are an integral part of the plot and of the literature that simultaneously realizes and structures it. School is the specific place that delineates the arena of formal education and shapes its individual time patterns, both as activity frameworks and as markers of, among other things, the pace of school learning in terms of time (school year, semesters, trimesters, school day, 45-minute lessons and 15-minute recesses). So, too, does non-formal pedagogy have its typical structures of time and place.[19]

The images of place in the literature of non-formal pedagogy include margins, networks, alternative homes and anywhere.

The term "margins" delineates the space in which non-formal pedagogy exists (Jeffs, 2002). Circumscribing non-formal education within the margins of "complementary education" on the one hand and "alternative education" on the other (LaBelle & Sylvester, 1990) demarcates it in relation to formal education. That is, the function of complementary education is to fill gaps in the formal educational system, while alternative education serves to criticize the formal system and offer itself as an alternative.[20]

Yet, the implications of the notion of margins that circumscribe the space of non-formal education emerge from definitions other than academic and formal ones; its repercussions are an inseparable part of two sub-narratives found in the practice of non-formal education.

The first sub-narrative concerns the centrality and importance of formal education and its margins in determining the substance of, investment in and legitimization of non-

formal education. The second involves marginality in the positive sense of the term, at least to the extent that all those engaged in non-formal education consider it to be avant-garde, innovative and intentionally maintaining its difference from formal education, which is perceived as canonical, conservative, old-fashioned and based on the "wrong" values.

The term "networks" defines the structure of the non-formal educational system and represents its communicative patterns. Thus, networks are also critical of formal education in that they stand out against the hierarchical and unified structure of the formal bureaucratic system and the educational institutions in which they exist to a greater or lesser extent. In addition, these networks promote a multidirectional and more symmetric form of communication, which has emerged because no single and unified bureaucratic hierarchy governs activities. Another reason is that these networks are comprised of diverse educational organizations run by a variety of operators and geared to numerous topics.

While school is the only setting for formal education, non-formal education takes place in an assortment of educational institutions, referred to variously as "nests," "branches," "clubhouses," "communes," "youth departments" and "community centers," to mention only a few. Those taking part in non-formal educational activities consider its venue their "alternative home," one that is cozy, homey, comfortable and accommodating. It is always possible, safe and comfortable to leave the alternative home in order to participate in activities. In addition to structuring the patterns of a different form of education, the concepts of alternative home and anywhere also reconstruct a family model. Thus, they censure the alienation, lack of identity and instrumental functionality found at school or in the workplace that is, in the official

setting where children, young people and adults spend their "compulsory time" in modern and post-modern societies.

The above images of place also generate the space for a different time as well, which is broken down into many images contributing to the singular literature of non-formal pedagogy.

First, images of leisure time as distinguished from compulsory time represent the typical division of time in the modern and post-modern world, for they signify relaxation, rest, and possibilities of ingenuousness and playfulness, as opposed to being serious, conforming to time schedules and appointments, and meeting obligations. Leisure time includes vacations and holidays, thus enhancing the traditional relationship between holidays and festivals and the seasons of the year.

Second, education is lifelong, and the deeper significance of learning is not restricted to a particular age. Thus, education can be considered a synonym for life itself.

Third, the flash rhythm of pedagogical activities is marked by the cyclical repetition of a beginning, middle and end in a ritual of sorts. On the one hand, this ritual marks an attempt to enhance and preserve tension and interest in the activity's educational content. On the other hand, it creates a spiral of expanded learning by approaching and withdrawing from diverse topics and forms, thus providing the option of re-examining the same topic in the same way as a possible model to be internalized through recurring experience.

Fourth, the developmental motif central to the basic assumptions of any pedagogy takes on a unique form in that it links the individual to the group, stipulating that development is the consequence of this bond. That is, as a desired pattern of

socialization, non-formal pedagogy insists on the mutual development of the individual and the group as the ideal condition to which it aspires. The group will develop so long as the individuals comprising it develop, and these individuals will develop so long as the group develops. In effect, this is a welcome and representative metaphor for the reciprocal relations between individual and society. Moreover, experimental time and trial and error take on new forms, leading to learning processes that are not geometrically linear. Rather, they can branch out into diverse shapes that offer possibilities for formulating a learning rhythm suitable both for the individual and for the group.

The images of time and place in non-formal pedagogy are structured; they continue to construct this pedagogical form as part of a social institution recognized by those engaged in it as well as by society as a whole. The question of the veracity of these images does not arise in this discussion, for they are presented as part of a narrative that has initiated a unique educational practice. This practice nurtures the activities of those organizations chosen specifically to examine its unique nature. Indeed, these images constitute one of the components that have shaped the notion of "phenomenological teaching."

2. Practices that engender phenomenological processes of teaching and learning through which knowledge is singularly negotiated

2.1 Theoretical insights

The notion of phenomenological teaching and learning in non-formal pedagogy implies that these processes take place around and in the context of complete and comprehensive phenomena that are seen to reflect a reality in which the participants

are an integral part. This approach has been recommended based upon numerous theoreticians. Therefore, it can be said that the practice of non-formal education has led to the development of a unique attitude toward knowledge and information, thus virtually predating the critical and theoretical discussion of this issue over the last forty years (Foucault, 1972; Popkewitz & Fendler, 1999).[21]

In the matter of knowledge and information as well, non-formal pedagogy has offered an alternative to the formal schooling that emerged with the industrial metaphor of the nineteenth century.[22] According to this metaphor, formal school learning results from an attempt to regard teaching in school as an efficient industrial commodity. Those who learned in school considered teaching to be a process whereby adults teach children, transmitting knowledge as if the children were empty vessels and the knowledge was an object to be deposited in them. In this industrial model, teachers package knowledge by breaking it down into small units; then, by offering incentives (or threatening punishment), they encourage their students to fulfill this mission of transmitting knowledge. The learners, according to this model, have very little to do except to render themselves worthy of being "filled" by the knowledge supplied by teachers and texts (Rogoff, 2001).

Learning, and hence non-formal teaching as well, is portrayed in the professional literature as taking place consequent upon a flexible daily routine resulting from negotiation between educators and learners that takes place during group work and oral rather than written communication and that defies standard assessment (Davies, 2000).[23] The learning process exists in the life environment of the learners; it is usually experimental and not planned by the learner, though its content is an important component of the intentions of the service supplier or agency. The

curriculum is based on substantive disciplines that are "submerged" in the activity content, but it is more intended to solve problems, whether of individuals or of groups or whether domestic or economic, therefore focusing on localized needs.

Didactic lesson plans are related to non-formalism in that they take place "outside" of what is considered to be formal learning and in that they lay emphasis on a unique pursuit as opposed to the general tendency to grant public recognition to what has been learned (McGivney, 1999).[24]

Lave and Wenger (1991) have discussed the outstanding components of non-formal teaching and learning.[25] They used the term "situated learning" in order to, among other things, highlight the relationship between individual and society and its significance to learning processes on the cognitive as well as the emotional level. They hypothesized that learning involves the entire human ethos and presumes a connection not only to specific activities but also to social communities. Thus, in the non-formal sense, to learn can be seen as to transform individuals into participants, community members, indeed into a particular type of human beings. According to this viewpoint, learning can only to some extent facilitate new activities, fulfill new tasks or roles and master new insights. Activities, tasks, roles and insights are all part of broader systems in which they take on meaning.

From Lave and Wenger's arguments, we can deduce that innovative learning occurs in an environment of innovation, and conversely, in a conservative environment learning is preservative.

Greenfield and Lave (1996) investigated the training of apprentice weavers and tailors as a paradigm for non-formal education in a familial atmosphere, comparing it to

school learning. One of their conclusions was that in the future education should seek its inspiration beyond the school wall in order to benefit from the rich tradition of non-formal education, even though the dichotomies between formal and non-formal education are more blurred than is customarily assumed. Greenfield and Lave thought that categories such as "teaching through illustration" and "learning by observation and imitation" are not sufficient to mark the difference between formal and non-formal education. Nor are other techniques, including "trial and error," "verbalization" and "collective participation." Their study refuted the assumption that pedagogical organization and preparation are of minor importance in non-formal education; moreover, it confirmed that the possibility of generalization and abstraction through learning problem-solving skills is inherent in every educational form, including in school. Most of those with a radical perspective who participated in the "situated learning" study agree that knowledge undergoes structuring and metamorphosis as it is used, that learning is an integral part of constant interaction with the world, and that learning itself is not problematic. In contrast, what is learned is problematic in that it requires coping with bodies of knowledge, learners and cultural transfer that must be conceptualized as social and cultural commodities (Greenfield & Lave, 1982).[26]

2.2 A generalized description of non-formal educational activities

In the current study, organizations engaged in non-formal education in Israel were investigated and analyzed. These included youth movements, community centers, "alternative" educational systems, museums with educational departments or branches and governmental agencies offering cultural and other activities geared to young people. The examination revealed a prevailing across-the-board consistency in how information and knowledge were processed in their activities. This consistency has

led us to designate those activities oriented toward transmitting information and knowledge in teaching-learning settings as phenomenological learning.

For the most part, these activities are organized and directed by an instructor or moderator; they take place in small groups of around twenty people and are usually focused upon some form of practical experience. The activity is usually short, and the time may or may not be formally organized (at least superficially). During this time, the members of the group play or talk, thus creating a distinction between what occurred prior to the activity and its actual beginning. The apparent purpose of this preliminary time period for teaching and learning is to enable the members to come together around the experience that is about to take place, thus fostering concentration and anticipation. Usually the activity begins with a trigger that launches group discussion and dialogue. The trigger can be in the form of posing a question or playing a game, watching a movie or looking at a picture or scenery, reading a text, or building or assembling something. The trigger raises the subject to be discussed or treated during the activity as an integral part of an overall experience, that is, without any judgments or evaluation. As the activity progresses toward discussion, this openness is gradually narrowed and directed toward particular values. No time limits are set for the trigger, which can be spread out over a long stretch of experiences, such as setting out on an excursion, building something or playing a game. Alternatively, it can be short, surprising and very quick. After the trigger has been activated, a guided conversation takes place, constituting the core of the specific educational activity. This is where teaching and learning come into play, brought together by their focus upon the event.

Examples of events initiating this type of teaching and learning include ethical issues, current events, community goals, social problems, political problems, personal problems, social dilemmas, historical sites or events, scientific sites or events, cultural or artistic sites or events. While teaching and learning are in process, the members of the group are invited to discuss the topic at hand through guided questions or specific instructions; thus, the subject under discussion is broken down.

Singling out the areas in which an organization engaged in non-formal education specializes depends upon the social, cultural and political ideology steering the particular organization. This stipulation grants the organization its specific identify, while at the same time justifying it and providing it with a reason for its existence. Its curriculum is created based on this specialization, which determines how it will be organized across time and place.

This complex form of teaching and learning is marked by two central and essential attributes. First, as opposed to formal education in school, here the phenomenological event rather than the teacher shapes the interdisciplinary background used in learning. For example, learning about environmental studies on a field trip involves considering a panoramic landscape.

What is observed is a totality, and relating to that totality calls for an interdisciplinary approach. By breaking the subject down into individual disciplines, it is possible to divide the phenomenon of environmental studies into its parts or at the very least to examine a number of its components in depth. Indeed, the very presence of a phenomenon that is, the complete environment which has motivated the disciplinary discussion of how to break it down, usually prompts its reassembly as well. Thus,

after the phenomenon has been broken down into disciplines, there is usually an individual, multidisciplinary consideration that imbues reexamining the phenomenon with new significance. That is, while the educational organization determines what is to be examined, discussed or dealt with, it is the ideological direction that through the very act of choice determines how phenomenological teaching and learning are practiced, thus initiating a ritual that transforms some of the knowledge conveyed by organizations engaged in non-formal education into their exclusive practice. This practice includes an overall examination of the chosen reality, breaking it down through a more focused look into its components, usually through a particular discipline, and then reassembling it with the addition of new information or knowledge engendered during the breakdown process.

Moreover, while formal teaching and learning sever reality from what is learned, thus creating a fragmented sense of reality, non-formal learning links teaching and learning to the reality that it has chosen to nurture through dynamic demonstration. The message it transmits is that knowledge and information are engendered as a result of what already exists. Tracing the phenomenon across time, whether by delving into the past or by forging into the future during an activity, is based on what has been comprehended, seen, heard or read, or in other words, on what somehow has been perceived as existing and actual to the learner's vital experience. That which exists in the here and now, that which has been chosen as "existing in the present" as the phenomenon to be studied is, then, an inseparable part of the ideology that guides an educational organization in formulating its activities.

Much of the current research concerning non-formal learning deals with learning at work (Boud & Garry, 1999; Coffield, 2000).[27] Even so, we found that some of the

conceptual considerations of this research can be applied to understanding non-formal learning as an exclusive roadmap for processing information and knowledge in the organizations engaged in non–formal education in Israel. Eraut (2000) proposes a typology of non-formal learning comprised of implicit learning, reactive learning and deliberative learning.[28] These three learning types were examined in trials over time, with emphasis on past events, present experiences and future behavior. The intersection of these learning types in different trials over time facilitated formulating a theory of stages and types of non-formal learning.

Insert Table 1 here

The order of non-formal learning types in non-formal educational organizations in Israel is contrary to that presented in Eraut's typology. Responsibility for deliberative and planned learning is assumed by the organization itself. In some organizations, learners are included in planning learning and teaching at the macro level at advanced stages of participation, after the results of the two learning types, implicit and reactive, have been applied over time. This application has designated that past events, ongoing experience, and presumably future behavior be guided by phenomenological learning as well as by the organization's style and norms. At the micro level, these organizations enlist learner participation by deliberately activating the conscious creation of links between present experience and personal relevance, thus forging a bond between past, present and future. This process is usually motivated by a challenge posed through asking questions or seeking responses as an

inherent part of the teaching process. The response desired or expected from the participants does not involve reiterating knowledge or information imparted previously by the teacher, as is the usual case in school. Rather, it involves conceptual legitimization of individual and/or group interpretation with respect to the phenomenon that initiated the learning process as perceived by the organization. The extent and flexibility of the instructor's or moderator's response to this individual and/or group interpretation (Beckerman, 2000) is dependent upon the organization's fundamental ideology as well as upon its degree of permissiveness and conceptual pluralism.[29] Still, in most cases the discussion begins with a general reference to the topic as a whole. Subsequently, the topic is narrowed down and the discussion is directed toward what has been determined as the objective of the activity, all the time referring to the organization's guiding principles.

Non-formal pedagogy does not deliberately declare it will carry out teaching and learning; in practice, however, it does indeed implement such processes. Identifying, characterizing and analyzing the significance of these processes brings out elements of the unique narrative of this pedagogy, thus illustrating, we believe, the structure of the educational plot, in which information and knowledge play a significant role. In this context, information and knowledge are first and foremost presented as immediately useful and relevant in that they are related to the phenomenon being studied, which in itself is part of the daily routine. As opposed to formal teaching, which usually distinguishes between information and knowledge and tends to dismantle them, non-formal pedagogy activates a mechanism for declining or conjugating knowledge and information in accordance with understanding, seeing or hearing an actual phenomenon, that has been selected and subsequently explained or

understood by means of "filters" put in place by the ideology guiding the organization engaged in non-formal education.

The unique way in which knowledge and information are treated in non-formal learning and teaching is also bound up in the nature of the social framework in which the learning takes place, that is, the group, in which the forms of discourse open up conversational spaces characterized by dialogue and discussion.

3. Practices that apply dialogue and conversation in teaching and learning processes.

Longstanding evidence indicates that learning in school for the most part serves to mediate between learners and sources of information and knowledge. The teacher serves as mediator, on the one hand interpreting the sources and on the other examining how the students have absorbed the information or knowledge.[30] The information is transmitted primarily through linear communication that constructs answers to questions known in advance.[31]

Non-formal teaching and learning processes, in contrast, are marked by more varied forms of conversation that offer broader pedagogic objectives than those in school and that do not profess to passing on objective knowledge or information. Most of those engaged in the study of non-formal education or non-formal learning note that these educational forms are predominantly characterized by, among other things, conversations, dialogue and debate.

Moreover, Kahane (1997) stresses that the non-formal curriculum is based on an amalgamation of written and oral repertoires and on dialogue facilitating a combination of methods, forms of knowledge, types of repertoires and perspectives as

an inseparable part of a unique code. This code, referred to by Kahane as "the non-formal code," in the past heralded and today manifests the attributes of the post-modern period.[32]

Smith (1999) notes that even though conversation in non-formal educational activities seems vague and pointless, it is in fact a primary educational tool in that it encourages possibilities for people to meet, develops communicative skills, facilitates social harmony, and builds mutual trust among the members of the group so they can participate in a democratic society.[33]

For Wolfe (2001), conversation in non-formal educational activities takes place at the margins of knowledge and understanding. Basing her argument upon Vygotsky, Wolfe assumes that conversation contributes to efficient learning in that it facilitates expanding what is already known while integrating everyday experience.[34]

Research on conversation in non-formal educational activities (Silberman-Keller and Beckerman, 2003) has shown that it serves as a tool for group leaders or moderators, who use from 8% to 15% of their time in order, on the one hand, to direct the activity toward the goals they have set and on the other hand to verify that all members of the group are actively participating.[35]

Our examination of the educational activities in organizations engaged in non-formal education revealed that the following resources are central to shaping conversations: the design of the social and physical setting where the activity takes place, the activity's group leadership and how the leader or moderator intervenes in the activity.

3.1 The design of the social and physical setting

In modern schools, formal teaching and learning are distinguished by their physical setting, for the most part a classroom in which pupils sit in rows facing the teacher and the board, with their backs to the other pupils from whom they are separated by desks.

Non-formal teaching and learning take place in a variety of spaces, including in the street or outdoors, in a clubhouse or at a museum or anywhere else. These places are conceived of as inseparable from the daily routine.[36] In all of these spaces, a form of dispersal takes place as part of the activity, which is halted in order to assemble the participants. This assembly takes place while sitting in a circular group formation and engaging in conversation.

Sitting in a circle as part of teaching and learning, as opposed to sitting in a classroom in school, creates unique dynamics and pedagogic practices, as well as reflecting and structuring part of the narrative of non-formal pedagogy.

The circle as the setting for learning allows for eye contact among the members of the group as well as between the members and their instructor. The lack of a physical barrier (the schoolroom desk) enables freedom of movement and flexibility in dismantling and reassembling the circle. It also signals directness apparently stemming from a seating pattern that generates greater symmetry among the members of the group, for it does not physically separate the moderator or instructor from the individual group members. It also signifies the circular nature of conversational dynamics, moving from one group member to another, as well as the cyclic nature of the discussion, which produces conversational rounds of ongoing participation.

Furthermore, it creates a mimesis that emphasizes a spiral of perpetual repetition, cultivating the concept of mythic time in which participants draw towards or move away from the topic of the discussion/conversation in accordance with specific pedagogic needs.

The circular seating arrangement that forms the physical and social setting for non-formal educational activities helps create an unrestricted atmosphere and a sense of consolidation and naturalness that encourage verbal exchange within the group. On the other hand, the setting also facilitates closer social supervision and intentional discipline that apparently does not derive from the social and physical arrangement but rather from the dynamics engendered during the course of the activity and as planned within the activity framework.[37]

In my discussion of developmental time in non-formal pedagogy, I noted that one of the ideals of this pedagogy is to present educational activities as having a reciprocal developmental effect upon the individual in the group and on the group as comprised of individuals. The implications of this time image of developmentality stand in sharp contrast to the negative attitude inherent in this pedagogy toward the alienation found in modern social reality. This reality is described as cold, alienating, utilitarian, hierarchical and therefore negative.[38]

The circle formation as a reflection of the ideal for dialogue and discussion is consistent with the anti-alienation of non-formal pedagogy and thus constitutes a desired practice not only as the background or outline for teaching and learning but also as the pedagogical content in and of itself. This learning content is part of the experience of learning, and repeating it many times helps internalize its essence.

This generalization should best be particularized, for not all organizations engaged in non-formal education hold identical forms of conversation, nor do they share identical styles in group moderation and leadership.

Contrary to what is expected, dialogue and discussion operate in contrast to the universal goals designated for such practices and commonly found in the literature. These goals include developing listening skills, respecting others, and developing empathy, understanding and spontaneity.[39]

Examining these educational activities in the investigated organizations revealed that the course of the activity in which dialogue and discussion constitute the primary practice starts from a quite open situation, with a guided discussion focusing on the activity topic. The topics in such activities are varied; however, they are chosen in accordance with the central theme of the organization engaged in non-formal education, which directs both the choice of topic and how it is treated

The open conversation may be guided by a statement such as the following. "Human and civil rights are the touchstone of democratic regimes." Then, elements are introduced into the conversation to the open-ended introduction, for example by asking a more specific question or by using resources that serve to limit the breadth and depth of the discussion. Examples include hanging poster boards with partial information written on them, playing games leading to a specific conclusion or focusing on the individual experience of group members.

In this way, a narrow corridor is created leading to the conceptual compartmentalization of the activity, in which the subject matter confronts the organization's guiding political-cultural-social ideology. The highlight of the activity

occurs when all group members identify with the activity's central theme or at least express a unified opinion, thus meeting most of the objectives set in advance for the activity.

Katriel's concept of the group consolidation resulting from this unity does not follow from an entirely open dialogic process but rather from the conceptual transfer of specific contents.[40] Because conversation is not overly imbued with the luster of learning, the theme is often reinforced by reading texts as signs of seriousness and determination. The choice of such texts and their introduction into the conversation also coincide with the ideology of the non-formal educational organization where the activity takes place.

The combination of the flexibility of circular conversations and the ideological emphasis on an insistence on structuring the content of non-formal educational activities creates an amalgamation in which both flexibility and strictness are obscured. This ambiguity apparently sets the tone for two major elements of significant learning. One is related to transmitting knowledge with a clear ideological disposition, while the other allows the attitude of the individual or the group to this ideology to provide opportunities for formulating opinions with respect to the information learned during the discussion.

3.2 The Role of Ideology in Educational Activities

The ideological content of an activity derives from the type of ideology guiding the organization in which the activity takes place.

Accordingly, we can distinguish a continuum of sorts. At one end are educational organizations with a static ideology marked by clear, naturalized and unequivocal

beliefs. Thus, the ideological implications of the topics discussed in the conversation are natural sociological and cultural phenomena.

At the other end of the continuum are organizations espousing dynamic ideologies and conscious of their own ideological orientation. These organizations tend to be more ideologically diverse and hence more permissive and flexible in their implications.[41]

Stasis as a characteristic component of ideologies is related to their topical repertoire; static ideologies serve to foster the survival, enhancement and preservation of the relevant group. Consider, for example, educational organizations that promote the national, ethnic, religious and cultural views of the social group to which they belong. Such organizations must perfect and preserve means and resources for implementing group survival and unity, thus distinguishing between the pertinent group and other groups in society.

Dynamic ideological content is characterized by a conceptual direction according to which if some sort of injustice restricts possibilities for group existence, the causes of this injustice are attributed primarily to internal social variables. This approach fosters internal reflection within the group and supports change, whether gradual or radical, in order to expand the group's living space.

The Israeli non-formal educational organizations examined in this research represent an ideological amalgam, combining both static and dynamic ideologies. This mix has implications upon how the subject matter of educational activities is processed.

The role of ideology as a desired and appreciated element in non-formal educational organizations turns them into groups advocating a particular issue or topic.

Consequently, despite the stated intention of many of these organizations to engage in widespread, comprehensive and universally leaning political and civil education, most tend to conform closely to the organization's guiding ideology as the major practice to which the conversational activities are subject. Thus, the impression is created that such educational objectives as developing communications skills, fostering freedom of opinion and expression and promoting tolerance, which are integral to almost all the organizations investigated and which constitute part of the narrative used by non-formal pedagogy to cultivate democracy, clash with each individual organization's tendency to concentrate on those conversational features that enhance its ability to advocate its own ideology.

We can assume that development of the ability to unite within the group and generation of a basis for establishing options for defending the group's ideas out of a sense of belonging enhance the capacity for participation in public/political/civil/social discourse. Indeed, by means of the practice of circular conversations, non-formal pedagogy generates the conditions necessary for participation in the required social game. These include unification, group identification, filling leadership roles, both active and passive, advocacy, building arguments, persuasion and creating consensus.

Group leaders and the leadership patterns they adopt play a central role in the practice of "circular conversations" as a primary pattern in non-formal teaching-learning processes.

3.3 Group Work in Educational Activities

In considering the topic of group work, the professional literature has classified types of groups and leadership styles as an integral element that positions group work as a tool meeting a wide variety of professional and social functions.

Research on organizations engaged in non-formal education in Israel indicates that group work is a fundamental and distinguishing feature of non-formal pedagogy. Indeed, in the organizations studied, the group serves as an educational resource. Just like the class in school, the group in non-formal education constitutes the smallest unit in the organization and the primary framework in which teaching and learning take place.

Consequently, the group both builds and evidences deliberation as an intrinsic part of planned teaching and learning. Because the objectives of the educational activities within non-formal pedagogy are deliberative—as specific content and as experience—the group work can be classified as task-oriented.

In non-formal pedagogy, this task orientation generates a flexible yet at the same time rigid group structure. The group is rigid in that it was convened to function for a specific time period determined in advance. Yet this rigidity becomes more flexible as the group breaks down into activities, defined tasks and subsequent meetings that determine how the group practices breaking up and coming together again, thus rejoicing in its very existence.

The process of breaking down into numerous learning encounters helps establish group identity, for the learning content involves cultivating group spirit. This notion of the group as an entity can be understood by analyzing the objectives of non-formal

educational activities as a means of developing individual as well as social identity, as explained from a sociological as well as a psychological perspective in the literature of group work:

> ...Every human being has a need to define himself and to identify his identity as differing from the identities of others. Social identity serves as a prototype for the individual; it organizes experiences and coping patterns in a variety of contexts into a common system of references. Identity is a concept whose meaning is social, that is, it is meaningless if it lacks a distinct consensus among other people and it can be realized only through the hopes of others. ...Individuals classify and define themselves as belonging to a distinct social category, providing them with a social identity...[42]

It appears that in contemporary non-formal education, group work fills a role that in the past was fulfilled by more traditional frameworks, such as the family, the tribe and the community. In non-formal education such learning is deliberative and planned, and therefore its educational content is mimetic and experiential.[43] The ideology of this content, that is, its vitality and its positive impact on the group, is shaped by statements that are part of the daily discourse in non-formal educational organizations. Often these statements are the objectives of group activities, and in contrast to what goes on in school and at work, they positively evaluate group interaction. These objectives praise the group impact on educational activities and censure the alienation, divisiveness and perfunctoriness of school. According to non-formal pedagogy, the group as educational content and educational setting also has an impact upon how the group leader or moderator functions.

3.4 Group leaders and moderators

In the organizations studied, the leader or moderator is supported by organizational frameworks such as instructional centers that serve as a nerve center for planning the

educational activities. Moreover, the leader or moderator is the direct and dominant educational figure in the learning groups.

Some of the literature of non-formal education defines these leaders or moderators as educators working with individuals or groups in the community in order to promote learning. Their work is described as transpiring in ordinary places rather than in classrooms, and they make use of non-formal teaching and learning methods, such as group discussions and activities.[44] The leaders and moderators are also expected to be able to process information flexibly (Mahoney, 2001), engage in group leadership and group work (Turnbull, 2001), carry out projects (Payne, 2001), work within community networks (Gilchrist, 2001) and prepare curricula and organizational and management work plans (Riley, 2001).[45]

The assortment of skills sought in those working in non-formal education theoretically seems to move the discussion away from the notion of the leader/moderator as an educational figure directly guiding learning processes in the activities. Nonetheless, the characterization given in the literature is compatible with what emerges from the study of non-formal educational organizations in Israel as well as with Kahane's (1997) definition of the non-formal curriculum in that it encompasses a variety of repertoires and types of knowledge. The resulting profile of the non-formal educational worker thus contravenes modern definitions of the term "specialization." Specialization assumes focusing on and delving into a specific area, while the professional bricolage, to use a term coined by Levi-Strauss, of the group leader/moderator seems to contradict the capacity for focusing and delving more deeply. The curriculum vitae of those engaged in non-formal education show that they voluntarily participated in educational organizations such as youth movements or

community centers and went on to specialize in roles and tasks that made them more flexible in their professional functioning.[46] This flexibility reflects the ability to change direction as necessary, sometimes emphasizing teaching and learning issues, other times creating educational materials, and on occasion engaging in organizational planning and administration. This transition from one function to another is part of specializing in non-formal pedagogy and has an impact on each and every specific function. It lads to movement and passage among repertoires and in particular encourages significant involvement in all that goes on in the organizations, thus serving to enhance unity and a sense of belonging.

Among the metaphors describing the role of the leader/moderator in the written material examined for this study are: producer, organizer, enabler, conversationalist, leader, and friend. None of these metaphors take into account the intellectual and didactic aspects of this position.

The current study also indicated that educational activities are planned and that group leaders/moderators prepare in advance for meeting with their groups, both in terms of learning about the participants and in terms of planning the educational content. Among the variables taken into consideration by these leaders were: the age of the learning group, the developmental status of the individuals and the group, the type of participants, their willingness to learn, their motivation, particular needs that had been pinpointed, areas of interest of group participants, desired pursuits and interpersonal dynamics within the group. These preparations, together with building the activity agenda, constitute an integral part of the leader/moderator's job. Training for this job involves preparation for these functions as well.

This advanced preparation raises some concerns, for it contradicts both the dimension of symmetry as defined by Kahane (1997) and the spontaneity that marks non-formal educational activities. Symmetry between educator and learner refers to the balance of power between them; it describes a condition in which the educator cannot force his opinion on the learner. Spontaneity refers to the unplanned interaction belonging to the same family of social circumstances that Katriel, based on Elster, termed "situations that are necessarily by-products," that is, that cannot be produced by direct and deliberate activity (Katriel, 1999).[47]

The contradictions between what is described in the literature as characteristic of non-formal educational activities and their actual manifestation in the field stand out in light of the findings of studies that examined deliberation and how it is directed by leaders/moderators in the field (Beckerman, 2000; Beckerman & Silberman-Keller, 2000-2002).[48] These studies showed that in effect symmetry and spontaneity facilitate the creation of opportunities for expressing all types of opinions in a way that is too compartmentalized. This compartmentalization is consciously planned by the leaders/moderators in their preparations and their patterns of activity. Despite their declared openness and permissiveness, these leaders according to two prominent guidelines. First, they adhere to implementing the activity's objectives (which, as mentioned above, are usually subject to the objectives of the educational organization in which the activity takes place). Second, as explained by Beckerman (2000), they are incapable of permitting conversations outside the hegemonic idiosyncrasy.[49]

We can therefore conclude that there is, in fact, a great deal of symmetry and spontaneity in activities conducted in accordance with non-formal pedagogy. But this symmetry and spontaneity are not part of "situations that are necessarily by-products."

Rather, they constitute working tools and learned skills engendering a unique atmosphere, which for the most part is interpreted as more permissive than that of school. These working tools and skills do not obliterate the existence of the "asymmetric relations" essential to educational or instructional situations, nor do they open the field up to total improvisation. Asymmetric relations, in which the educator is superior to the pupil as is essential in learning situations, tend to be moderated in two primary directions: one is by concealing the style of instruction/moderation in a cloak of permissiveness expressed primarily by discourse characterized by listening, respect for others and tolerance while functioning with a reasonable modicum of authority; the other is through a professional approach that enables the instructor/moderator to modify leadership techniques according to educational conditions and diagnostic judgment of these conditions.[50]

The same can be said for spontaneity. For the most part, the activities are spontaneous, and this spontaneity is used primarily to take advantage of the group's dispersal to provide repeated opportunities to stick to the activity's topic and to guide it toward topical coherence. In such cases, the leaders/moderators are more or less empathetic toward any digression from the topic, thus strongly emphasizing the deliberative nature of the activity based on what was planned. For example, the leader/moderator can use free association to show the relationship between the pupil/trainee and the activity topic. Both symmetry and spontaneity are work tools that foster permissiveness and a more open atmosphere, and perhaps because of them the leaders or moderators are not thought to be directing teaching and learning processes even though in practice they do, in fact, carry out such processes.

Leaders/moderators, circular conversations and group work can be placed along a communicative continuum of the components of typical conversationality in non-formal pedagogy by respectively presenting the transmitter, the message and the receiver. Yet, a closer look helps pinpoint the dual role filled by these three factors: on the one hand, the function performed by the group leader/moderator participates in the practice of transmitting messages; on the other hand, in circular conversations and in group work, this function is itself an educational message, and by virtue of its functioning is also a receiver as well.

This circularity, produced by the multiple roles played by the communicative components of educational activities and an integral part of the dialogue and discourse of non-formal pedagogy, serves both as a powerful metaphor and as a resource that builds and evidences this unique pedagogy.

4. **Practices that use play to shape the bond between reality and probability by expanding the notion of what is considered within the bounds of plausible reality.**

Four patterns of play in non-formal educational activities emerged from the current study:

1. Guided play from the time the group assembles until the activity begins: distinguishes between ordinary life and the educational activity about to take place.

2. Triggers to launch the activities: invite the broad and all-encompassing openness of circular conversations as described above.

3. Games as experiential components of the activity itself: serve as a means to demonstrate a condition or to experience the topic under discussion, as well as an element in the teaching-learning discourse.

4. Spontaneous games that are not part of the planned educational activity: the considerable use of games in educational activities may well inspire a play atmosphere, which in turn invites spontaneous and undirected games that take place during recess or before and after the activity (such as ping pong, soccer, basketball, board games, hopscotch and catch).

Numerous types of games are proposed in the activity manuals and guides of youth movements, community centers and government agencies offering cultural and sports activities geared to young people. The characteristic modularity found in the instructions to these games sets the tone for how to take them apart and put them back together again. This practice offers a variety of game prototypes to be applied innovatively in other games as well. Thus, an extremely broad repertoire of games is available for use by educational organizations that operate according to non-formal pedagogy. Usually, supplementary instructions are included in the repertoire to facilitate integrating other games in whole or in part. These instructions also enhance the capacity for ongoing invention and assembly, often referred to as creativity in the non-formal ethos.

Following is a partial list of games mentioned in these manuals: bingo, dilemma games, riddles, relay races, dominoes, quiz shows, crossword puzzles, word searches, brain teasers, mosaics, model building, paperbag dramatics, grapevine, skits, scavenger hunts, catch, treasure hunts, auctions, role-playing, amusement park games,

ball games, board games and even computer games. This list encompasses a wide assortment and can be used to identify prototypes, which have been classified as follows by Callois (1958):[51]

- Games of conflict (agon): a group of competitive games. In these games, an artificial condition of equal opportunity is created so that participants can compete under ideal circumstances in order to turn winning into a positive value. The main idea of these games is that the winner's superiority in a particular area will be undoubtedly realized. The practice of agon games requires a great deal of attention and concentration, appropriate trust, perseverance and the will to win. It also requires discipline and consistency. It allows independence in making decisions with respect to how to best play the game and forces participants to play within set borders and in accordance to rules applicable to all, so that the winner's superiority is beyond debate.

- Games of chance (alea): a group of games that are not dependent upon decisions made by the players but rather upon circumstances beyond their control. In these games, it is fate that determines the winner. In a competition between players, the winner is simply luckier than the loser. In contrast to competitive games, games of chance negate work, tolerance and experience, and they are not based on training, diligence or belief.

According to Callois, the shared significance both of competitive games and of games of chance is complementary. Both conform to the consistency found in creating absolutely equal conditions for all players. In real life, equality is usually denied to the players, because "nothing is clear in life" and everything is "confusing" at the outset,

including taking chances and trying as well. Thus games, whether competitive or based on chance, represent an attempt to generate the ultimate alternative to the confusion of everyday life by crating ideal set of circumstances.

- Games of mimicry: This type of game emphasizes the temporary illusion of belief in the existence of an imaginary universe. In such games, a player tries to convince others that he is someone else. Games of mimicry are the ultimate realization of the characteristics of play: freedom, persuasion, demarcation of reality, departmentalization of time and place, all of which involve constant invention. There is only one rule to the game: persuading the observer by eliminating the possibility for error and therefore shattering the illusion of the existence of an alternative reality. Those observing such games must give in to the deception without being exposed to or distracted by the means used to create it.

- Games of vertigo (ilinx): games based upon seeking a sense of vertigo as a result of trying to destroy equilibrium and to sanely and consciously elicit a feeling of sensory threat. Games of vertigo are based on giving in to some sort of shock that suddenly and callously destroys reality.

The shared and intersecting tendencies among the game types found in the organizations studied along with the major game prototypes identified by Callois together represent a list classified according to the educational objectives that can be achieved by the games. And indeed, the game manuals analyzed in this study explicitly outline the educational achievements expected from each game that are integrated into educational activities. These achievements include: promoting

accuracy, reliability, workmanship, creativity, punctuality and obedience; developing individual opinions and formulating them in arguments; creating consensus; improving reading and critical reading skill; enhancing mathematical abilities; developing physical and motor skills; generating identification and empathy; acquiring knowledge and information; orienting the self in space; developing imagination and conversational ability. These desirable educational achievements are termed the game objectives. Often games of vertigo and games of chance are both integrated into educational activities in order to meet these objectives.

In non-formal pedagogy, educational games (i.e., games of competition and mimicry) may co-exist with their opposite (games of chance and vertigo), among other reasons because of play's dominant role in this pedagogy, which appears to endorse its educational nature yet at the same time repudiate it.

The recent work of Sutton-Smith (1997)[52] addresses the inherent ambiguity of play and identifies it as a cultural phenomenon. The study can be applied to understanding the essential and overriding ambiguity of non-formal pedagogy as well. Sutton-Smith bases the work on Empson's typology (1955) of seven types of ambiguity, adding to it the notion of play as representing a variety of game forms and experiences, of players, of play agencies and forums, and of theoretical approaches to play. He used all these to examine the ideologies guiding game practice as well as game theory, leading to the assumption that they are linked as an inseparable part of the game's fundamental meaning.

Based on the above, Sutton-Smith identified seven types of play rhetoric: (1) play as progress; (2) play as fate; (3) play as power; (4) play as identity; (5) play as

imagination; (6) play as the self; (7) play as frivolity. According to Sutton-Smith, all of these forms of discourse regarding play, along with their rhetorical names, emphasize that every rhetoric represents values within ideologies. Those espousing these ideologies, whether in the form of theories or of games, live according to them and attempt to convince others to believe in them.

The insights found in Sutton-Smith's research can help characterize non-formal pedagogy. These insights are evident on many occasions and at many levels in the planned educational activities of the non-formal educational organizations examined in this study. As noted above, non-formal pedagogy initiates educational activities characterized by games of competition, chance, simulation and vertigo. Some of the overt and covert objectives of this pedagogy are related to the development of self-identity, some to creating group identity and unity, and some to a celebration of social passages. Thus the ambiguity inherent in the significance of play as a phenomenon shaped by a number of different and often contradictory play rhetorics is also a part of non-formal pedagogy.

Like other practices in non-formal pedagogy, not only does play project its existence as a routine and frequent practice but it also lends significance to non-formal pedagogy. Thus play represents content learned through experience.

What, then, is the significance of this essential playfulness as learned content in non-formal pedagogy?

When adding playfulness to questions typical of every pedagogy–what is learned? who does the learning? who teaches whom? –the result is a series of answers that obscure unequivocal responses and project ambivalence with respect to the routine

and customary answers in contemporary society. The educational activities initiated by non-formal pedagogy take place outside what is defined as the compulsory timetable and in a variety of locations that are not necessarily identified as learning sites. The activities are guided sometimes by certified educators and sometimes by friends and peers by means of discourse that obscures the accepted forms of discourse in learning. Therefore, and if we consider teaching and learning as shaping a way of relating to reality that is in itself learning content, the forms of play in non-formal pedagogy shape the bond between reality and probability by expanding the notion of what is considered within the bounds of plausible reality.

In this sense, non-formal pedagogy is also a simulation of sorts. It appears to be education, for along with motivating and maintaining non-formal education, at the core of its practice it engenders logical comparison/contrasts: learning/no learning, serious/not serious, methodical/not methodical, realistic/unrealistic, knowledge/no knowledge, content/no content, place/no place, time/no time, teaching/no teaching. These contrasts simultaneously construct and deconstruct the methodology, seriousness, professionalism and realism of non-formal pedagogy. It is a pedagogy that represents what is different as opposed to that which is socially and culturally clear and that which is acceptable as serious, realistic and systematic learning taking place at a specific time and place with understandable contents. That is, it is the opposite of all that characterizes learning in school.

Social caveats with respect to the essential playfulness of non-formal pedagogy are interwoven with attitudes toward play itself, toward its rhetoric and its ambiguity, thus defining non-formal pedagogy not only as a mechanism for change or as a potential

and experimental arsenal of repertoires, but rather as a symbolic system that has instigated a different education, one that is both representative and behavioral.

This is not to say that there are no connections between formal and non-formal education; in effect, there are, in various configurations and quantities. Yet, together or separately, their singularity and their potential for development can only become clear upon realizing that they are, indeed, two separate educations, one providing the conventional and canonical definition of education and related terms, and the other serving to interpret the components of education in a distinctive way. It is the very discrepancy between the two that enables each to be a factor in the self-definition of the other.

Conclusion

In his book on board games, David Parlett expands on Houssaye's statement in *The Playing Man:* "Every game has its own rules." Parlett thus determines that "every game *is* its rules, for they are what define it".[53]

This statement is applicable to pedagogies as well, in that they are identified, differentiated, and managed according to their content and behavior, which determine their very nature.

Non-formal pedagogy is defined by its practices. In this essay, I have considered four central practices found in most non-formal teaching and learning. The discussion has shown that these practices are an inseparable part of the education imparted by organizations engaged in non-formal education in Israel. Hence, through its practice, non-formal pedagogy exhibits a harmony of sorts that amalgamates the goals, means

and products of educational activities. This harmony converts practice into educational content, and it benefits from a clearly simulative nature.

The simulative nature of non-formal pedagogy can be understood from the fact that it presents itself as an alternative to what has emerged as the almost exclusive connotation of education from the 19th century until today as manifested in school and in formal education. This alternative is expressed in the positioning of practices that shape and are shaped by images of time and place, ways of processing information and knowledge, the range of educational activities, the profile of the role of educators and the use of play as the central educational practices according to which non-formal pedagogy operates. Its functioning engenders numerous similarities and contrasts: between life and learning, between reality and play, between formal knowledge/information and conversation, between spontaneity and structured planning, between compulsory time and leisure time, between educational institutions and anywhere as the venue for education, between individual and group, between instructor/teacher and facilitator, between experience and academic studies, between social, cultural and political ideologies and objective information and knowledge. Consistent with non-formal pedagogy, all these contrasts are designed to shape the activities of an education that envisions a specific way of seeing and being in the world. It enables participants–with a generous dose of permissiveness, for this is not ostensibly the "usual place for learning"– to develop and practice unique skills for learning and for decision-making, to explore new ways to frame their identity, to apply their intellectual and social empowerment, and to nurture their emerging enlightenment in a variety of fields.

Accordingly, the activities emerging from these comparisons and contrasts appear to cancel out the impression of simulation because they are not playacted but rather assume a realism according to which there are no games and no players in the usual sense of these terms. This is because such educational activities are not designed merely to elicit pleasure, enjoyment or social strife, but rather to offer a different type of practice, experience and training than what is offered by "real life."

Hence, non-formal educational workers do not consider themselves to be "actors" or "simulators." They are distinguished by their seriousness, sense of commitment, outstanding planning and bold implementation.

This seriousness can also be seen among the participants in these activities. Perhaps, at the height of the simulation, as in games of competition and chance, this seriousness contributes to what Callois has referred to as "...the creation for the players of conditions of pure equality denied them in real life. For nothing in life is clear, since everything is confused from the very beginning, luck and merit too.

Play, whether *agon* or *alea,* is thus an attempt to substitute perfect situations for the normal confusion of contemporary life..."[54]

The ambiguity typical of non-formal pedagogy is nourished by its practices, as are its practices fed by this ambiguity. Indeed, the practices foster ambiguity as a stabilizer between "real life" and "authentic learning" on the one hand and a possible alternative of a different and more ideal form of life and learning on the other. Indeed, it is this ambiguity that reinforces the institutionalization of formal pedagogy and of non-formal pedagogy as well. This attribute of non-formal pedagogy grants it its social-

cultural significance and enables it to be recognized by those engaged in it as well as by the general public.

The fact that non-formal pedagogy, as the ideological platform that generates the way for non-formal education to be in the world, has never been theoretically formulated but rather has been realized in practice testifies to its vitality and, perhaps, to its very essence as an entity that is lived and experienced more than discussed and written about. In this respect, it may be that its characteristic simulation implies the notion of "playing in order to learn," thus conferring upon this pedagogy the virtually indispensable role of "window to fantasy" by constituting a viable alternative to the study, thought and formulation of educational possibilities by realizing them in practice.

Notes

[1] Houssaye, J. (Ed.) *La Pedagogie: Une encyclopedie pour aujourd'hui*. (Paris, ESF, 1993).
Betrand, Y. & Houssaye, J. (1999) "*Pedagogie* and *Didactique*: An incestuous relationship," *Instructional Science*, 1999, 27, pp. 33-51.

[2] By-pass educational systems in Israel refer to educational organizations engaged in ideological education within as well as outside the school setting. See:
D. Keller, "By-pass educational systems: Repetition or Redundancy", M.A. Thesis (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1987). (Hebrew)

[3] D. Goldenberg and D. Steintsler (eds.), *Haphalopedia.* (Tel Aviv, Yedioth Aharonoth, 1994). (Hebrew)

[4] J. Bruner (1986) *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds.* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.) pp.11-43.

[5] D. Silberman-Keller. "A New Reading of the Goal of Education in Israel: The Intertextual Arena," *Iyunim B'Hinuch*, 1997, pp. 249-268. (Hebrew)

D. Keller, "Plot and Characters in Ideological Educational Texts." in A. Gur-Zeev (ed.), *Education in the Era of Postmodern Dialogue,* Jerusalem: Magnes, pp. 221-243. (Hebrew)

[6] On this topic, let me point out that I believe non-formal pedagogy is an ideal pedagogy. Furthermore, I believe that it should be investigated critically (but not invidiously), examining its impact upon the way in which education both shapes and has been shaped by the prevailing social and cultural context.

[7] See: T. Jeffs, "First lessons: historical perspectives on informal education," in L. D. Richardson & M. Wolfe (eds.) *Principles and Practice of Informal Education.* (London, Routledge Palmer Press, 2001), pp. 34-51.

[8] Since the 1970s, Prof. Kahane has been writing papers and books about the nonformal code. See, for example: R. Kahane, "A number of assumptions on the structure and function of non-formal educational systems in modern society," in Y. Miuhas, *Complementary Education.* (Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture, 1975), pp. 45-53. (Hebrew).
R. Kahane, *The Origins of Postmodern Youth: Informal Youth Movements in a Comparative Perspective* (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997).

[9] T. Jeffs & M. K. Smith, *Informal Education.* (London: YMCA, George Williams College, 1999).

[10] 'The Faure Report', UNESCO, 1972.

[11] P. Fordham , *Learning Networks in Adult Education* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979).

[12] P.H. Coombs & M. Ahmed, Attacking rural poverty: How non-formal education can help. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1974).
See also: T.J. LaBelle & J. Sylvester, "Delivery systems - formal, nonformal, informal," in *International Comparative Education,* ed. R Murray Thomas (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1990), pp. 141-160.
T. J. La Belle, "Formal, Nonformal and Informal Education: A Holistic perspective on lifelong learning," International Review of Education. V. 28, 1982. pp. 159-175.

[13] Bock & Papagianis, "Some alternatives on the role of non-formal education," in *National Development,* ed. Bock and Papagianis (U.S.A: Praeger Publishers, 1983), pp. 250-268.
C. A. Torres, *The Politics of Non-Formal Education in Latin America* (U.S.A: Praeger Publishers, 1990).

[14] Noam, G. (2002). *Afterschool education: approaches to an emerging field.* Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.
Rogoff, B., Paradise, R., Mejía Arauz, R., Correa-Chávez, M. & Angelillo, C. (2003). Firsthand learning through intent participation. *Annu. Rev. Psychol., 54*, 175-203.

[15] F. Coffield, The Necessity of Informal Learning (Bristol: The Policy Press, 2000).
J. Lave and E. Wenger, *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
P. Grenfield & J. Lave, "Cognitive Aspects of Informal Education," in Daniel A. Wagner & Harold W. Stevenson (eds.) Cultural Perspectives on Child Development. (San Francisco, W.H. Freeman and Company, 1982) pp. 182-207.

[16] At this stage, there are very few research studies or publications about the development of non-formal learning in science and history museums. However, reasonable funds have been allocated to large research projects integrating academia and practical implementation, for example The Center for Informal Learning and Schools, a collaboration of Exploratorium San Francisco, King's College London and The University of California Santa Cruz. See: www.exploratorium.edu/cils.
Another such collaboration is the Museum Learning Collaborative, a consortium of 15 museums and the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh: **http://mlc.lrdc.pitt.edu/default.html**
Noam, G. (2002). Afterschool education: A new ally for education reform, *Harvard Education Letter*, Research Online.

[17] See, for example:
Informal Learning in Workplace LO16731, Center for Workplace Development of Education Development Center, in Newton, Massachusetts, http://www.learning-org.com/98.01/0331.html
M. Dale and J. Bell, "Informal Learning in the Workplace," (London: Department for Education and Employment, 1999).
V. J. Marsick and K E Watkins, Informal and Incidental Learning in the Workplace (London: Routledge, 1991).
D. Boud and J. Garrick, eds., Understanding Learning at Work (London: Routledge, 1999).

[18] M. Gal, "Non-Formal Education in Israel--Coincidental Frameworks or Systems Meeting Unique Social and Educational Needs?" in W. Ackerman, A. Karmon and D. Zucker (eds.), *Education in a Changing Society.* (Tel Aviv, Jerusalem: Hakibbutz Hame'uhad and the Van Leer Institute, 1985), pp. 601-666.
Z. Lamm, "Complementary Education in the Theory of Changing the Educational Institution," in Y. Miuhas, *Complementary Education.* (Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture, 1975), pp. 38-44.

(Hebrew)

Noam, G. (2002). Afterschool education: A new ally for education reform, *Harvard Education Letter*,

Research Online.
R. Kahane, "A number of assumptions on the structure and function of non-formal educational systems in modern society," in Y. Miuhas, *Complementary Education.* (Jerusalem: Ministry of Education and Culture, 1975), pp. 45-53 (Hebrew).
D. Keller, "By-pass Systems: Repetition or Redundancy", M.A. Thesis (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1987). (Hebrew)
D. Keller, "Non-Formal Education in Israel: A Number of Directions in its Organizational and Pedagogical Definition" (reprint), Beit Berl College, 1996. (Hebrew)
Bock and Papagianis, "Some alternatives on the role of non-formal education," in National Development, ed. Bock and Papagianis (U.S.A: Praeger Publishers, 1983). pp. 250-268.

[19] D. Silberman-Keller (2001), "Toward the Characterization of Non-Formal Pedagogy: Images of Time and Place," *An Encounter for Educational Social Work*, No. 15, pp. 15-36. (Hebrew).

[20] T. Jeffs, "First lessons: historical perspectives on informal education". In L. D. Richardson & M. Wolfe (eds.) *Principles and Practice of Informal Education.* (London, Routledge Falmer Press, 2001), pp. 34-51.
T. J. LaBelle, & J. Sylvester, "Delivery systems - formal, non-formal, informal", in Murray Thomas, R. (Ed.) *International Comparative Education.* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1990). pp. 9-23.

[21] M. Foucault, *Power and knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980).

T. S. Popkewitz & L. Fendler, *Critical Theories in Education: Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics.* (New York, Routledge, 1999).

[22] Rogoff, Bartlett and Turkanis note that despite the attempt to make changes in formal teaching in school, the school routine in the U.S. has remained stable for the last century and is characterized by the following: it is compulsory for all children, it segregates between children and adults in the community, it isolates a few dozen children with a single adult who is responsible for their education, it groups children based on their birth dates in order to supply learning to a large number of children by means of gradual learning suitable to their age, it attempts to motivate children by giving grades. These researchers also note that these aspects of school have led many adults to assume that they are necessary attributes of all forms of learning.
B. Rogoff, C. G. Turkanis, L. Bartlett, (eds.) *Learning Together.* (Oxford, New – York: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 3.

[23] P. Davies, "Formalising Learning: the impact of accreditation," in Frank Coffield (ed) The Necessity of informal learning. (London: The Policy Press, 2000 pp. 54-64).

[24] V. McGiveney, Informal Learning in the Community. A trigger for change and development. (Leicester: NIACE, 1999).

[25] J. Lave and E. Wenger, *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

[26] P. Grenfield & J. Lave, "Cognitive Aspects of Informal Education," in D. A. Wagner & H. W. Stevenson (eds.) *Cultural Perspectives on Child Development.* (San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1982) pp. 182-207.

[27] D. Boud & J. Garrick, (eds.) *Understanding Learning at Work.* (London: Routledge, 1999).
F. Coffield, (ed.) *The necessity of Informal Learning.* (London: The Policy Press, 2000).

[28] M. Eraut, "Non-Formal Learning, Implicit Learning and Tacit Knowledge in Professional Work," in F. Coffield, (ed.) *The Necessity of Informal Learning.* (London: The Policy Press, 2000). pp. 12-32.

[29] Z. Beckerman, " Dancing in Words," reprint (Jerusalem: Hebrew University) (Hebrew).
See Z. Lamm, *In the Whirlpool of Ideologies: Education in the Twentieth Century.* Jerusalem, Magnes, 2002. pp. 110-170. (in Hebrew).
Ricoeur notes the existence of a longstanding tradition placing writing in a position inferior to oral conversation. The myth of Phaedo found in Plato's writings serves as parable for Ricoeur, through which it is possible to understand that the teacher's oral intercession is of the highest value and that the hierarchy of written and oral discourse as set out in teaching and learning drew its power from the hierarchy of these two forms of discourse as the ultimate interpreter.
P. Ricoeur, "The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action Considered as Text," *Social Research*, 38, 1971.pp. 528-562.
D. Edwards and N. Mercer, *Common Knowledge: The development of understanding in the classroom.* (New York: Routledge, 1993).
R. G. Tharp and R. Gallimore, *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning and schooling in social context.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)

[30] D. Edwards and N. Mercer, *Common Knowledge: The development of understanding in the classroom* (New York: Routledge, 1993).
R. G. Tharp and R. Gallimore, Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning and schooling in social context (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

[31] Z. Lamm, ibid.(2002), pp. 113 and following.

[32] R. Kahane, *The Origins of Postmodern Youth: Informal Youth Movement in a Comparative Perspective.* (Berlin, De Gruyter, 1997). pp. 119-121.

[33] M.K. Smith, "Place, space and informal education," in L D Richardson & M Wolfe (eds.) *Principles and practice of Informal Education.* (London: RoutledgeFalmer Press, 2001), pp. 138-147.

[34] M. Wolfe, "Conversation," in L D Richardson & M Wolfe (eds.) *Principles and practice of Informal Education.* (London: RoutledgeFalmer Press, 2001), pp. 124-137.

[35] R. Kahane, The Origins of Postmodern Youth: Informal Youth Movements in a Comparative Perspective (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), pp. 20-25.
T. Jeffs & M. K. Smith, *Informal Education* (London, YMCA George Williams College, 1999), pp. 21-31.
M. Wolfe "Conversation" in L D Richardson & M Wolfe (eds.) *Principles and Practice of Informal Education.* (London, RoutledgeFalmer Press, 2001), pp. 124-137.
D. Silberman-Keller & Z. Beckerman (in process) "Non-formal Pedagogy: Epistemology, Rhetorics and Practice".

[36] M. K. Smith, "Place, space and informal education," in L D Richardson & M Wolfe (eds.) *Principles and Practice of Informal Education.* (London, RoutledgeFalmer Press, 2001), pp. 138-147.

[37] Although the above description comparing the seating arrangement in a school classroom to that in non-formal educational activities expresses a dichotomy that does not always exist in practice in either of these two settings, the social educational activities proposed in the literature as part of innovative approaches in education are described or formulated in the spirit of non-formal pedagogy. See for example:
B. Rogoff, C. G. Turkanis, L. Bartlett, (eds.) *Learning Together*. (Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 2001) pp. 67-91.
T. Katriel, *Key Words: Cultural and Communicative Patterns in Israel.* (Haifa: University of Haifa Press, Zmura Beitan, 1999), pp. 148-169. (Hebrew).

[38] This criticism of modern life and the education that fosters it has been transferred to popular cinema and music by Pink Floyd in clips and in the movie *The Wall.*

[39] N. C. Burbules, *Dialogue in Teaching: Theory and Practice.* (New York and London, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1993).
R. C. Arnett, *Dialogic Education: Conversation about Ideas and Between Persons.* (US.A, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale and Edwardsville).
F. H. Van Eemeren & P. Houtlosser, "Strategic manoeuvering in argumentative discourse," *Discourse Studies* 1 (4) 1999, pp. 479-497.

[40] "...The term *gibush* (integration or solidification) is a key word in the Israeli social lexicon. It encompasses an entire cultural world, including the structure of society and the nature of social relations . . . it entails the embodiment of the famous Israeli sense of unity ... the metaphor of *gibush* also encompasses an entire social order, similar to the natural process of crystallization, from which the word is borrowed..."
Tamar Katriel, ibid., pp. 148-169.

[41] G. Walford, *Beyond Politics. (London, Calabria Press, 1990).*

[42] N. Rosenwasser, "Groupwork: A Means for Developing Community." In N. Rosenwasser (ed.), *Readings in Group Leadership* (Jerusalem: Zippori Center - The Matnas Company, 1997), p. 401. (Hebrew)
See also: D. Ullman, 'Kurt Lewin: His Impact on American Psychology, or Bridging the Gorge between Theory and Reality', 2000, **http://www.sonoma.edu/psychology/os2db/history3.html**
I.D. Yalom, *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy*, (New York: Basic Books, 1995).

[43] Compare to T. Katriel, ibid., pp. 157-160.

[44] M. E. Doyle, "On being an educator," in L D Richardson & M Wolfe (eds.) *Principles and Practice of Informal Education.* (London, RoutledgeFalmer Press, 2001), pp. 4 -16.
T. Jeffs & M. K. Smith, *Informal Education* (London, YMCA George Williams College, 1999) pp. 8-10

[45] Articles on these topics written by researchers noted in this paper have recently been compiled in the following book:

L. D. Richardson & M. Wolfe (eds.) *Principles and Practice of Informal Education.* (London, RoutledgeFalmer Press, 2001).

[46] The Israeli Scout movement has a training procedure, in which learning takes place through "joint investigation" on the part of the learner and the trainer, the intention of which is to encourage the learner to develop through performance, which is systematically monitored by the instructor. This system is explained and justified as follows:
"In order to gain the maximum from training scout leaders to lead scouting activities, we must systematically and methodically guide their implementation at every stage. The organized and formal training of scout leaders begins and ends with a course, after which the learning is carried out through unsupervised trial (throwing them into the water). The purpose of this training is to carry on learning during everyday activities in the scout troop, and learning through experience is the primary form of learning. A number of stages in the "learning cycle" are necessary to carry out the learning systematically. Israeli Scout Web Site. (Hebrew)

[47] T. Katriel, ibid. p. 158.

[48] Z. Beckerman, "Dancing with Words," reprint (Jerusalem: Hebrew University) (Hebrew).
In a graduate studies class at the Hebrew University School of Education, Z. Beckerman and D. Silberman-Keller examined patterns of functioning in non-formal educational activities on the assumption that they are guided by a unique pedagogy. Educational activities organized by students were photographed and videotaped, later serving as the topic of group discussion and reflective analysis.

[49] Z. Beckerman, "Dancing with Words," reprint (Jerusalem: Hebrew University) (Hebrew).

[50] Compare to: Z. Lamm, *The Contradictory Logics of Instruction* (Tel Aviv, Hapoalim Library, 1984). (Hebrew)

[51] R. Callois, *Man, Play and Games.* (New York: The Free Press, 1958).

[52] B. Sutton-Smith, *The Ambiguity of Play.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1997).

[53] D. Parlett, *The Oxford History of Board Games.* (Great Britain: Oxford University Press, 1999). p. 3.

[54] . ibid. p. 63

Table 1: A typology of non-formal learning

Time stimulus	**Implicit learning**	**Reactive learning**	**Deliberative learning**
Past episode(s)	Implicit linkage of past memories with current experience.	Brief **near spontaneous reflection** on past episodes, communications, events, experiences.	**Review** of past actions, communications, events, experiences. More systematic reflection.
Current experience	A selection from experience enters the memory.	Incidental noting of facts, opinions, impressions, ideas. **Recognition of** learning opportunities.	**Engagement** in decision making, problem solving, planned informal learning.
Future behavior	Unconscious effects of previous experiences.	Being prepared for **emergent** learning opportunities.	**Planned** learning goals. **Planned** learning opportunities.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: TOWARD THE CHARACTERIZATION OF NON-FORMAL PEDAGOGY	
Author(s): DIANA SILBERMAN-KELLER PH.D	
Corporate Source: BEIT BEAL COLLEGE - ISRAEL	Publication Date: 25.4.2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: DIANA SILBERMAN-KELLER PH.D
Organization/Address: BEIT BEAL COLLEGE DOAR BEITBERL 44905 - ISRAEL	Telephone: 00972-9-7476370 FAX: 00972-9-7476363 E-Mail Address: dianas@beitberl.ac.il Date: 25.4.2003

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
University of Maryland, College Park
1129 Shriver Lab
College Park, MD 20742